

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated September 4, 2007. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8, 13-14, 23-27, 33-34 and 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0190355 (“Jammes”). The rejections from the Office Action of is discussed below. No new matter has been added. Various claims have been amended for clarity and not for reasons related to patentability. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8, 13-14, 23-27, 33-34 and 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jammes. Jammes relates to a system for operating an electronic store that permits a merchant to organize and advertise products over the Internet. Jammes, Abstract. The system may include an interface for categorizing products and modifying those categories. *Id.* at ¶13.

Independent claims 1, 24 and 37 relate to the management of multiple stores as supported by the specification, for example at ¶39, ¶43 and Fig. 1 of 2005/0065856. Claims 1, 24, and 37 include an interface or product administration module for updating an e-commerce storefront and a product database for multiple stores. Jammes discloses a system for operating an online store that includes a product information database 116 and HTML page engine 126. Jammes, Fig. 1. The store includes a user interface 760 that displays product information and allows a user to edit categories. *Id.* at Fig. 7D. Jammes fails to disclose an interface for multiple stores as claimed. In particular, Jammes does not disclose that a single interface is used for updating the e-commerce storefront and product database for multiple stores as in claims 1, 24, and 37.

Jammes fails to disclose multiple stores that each access the product database, where each store includes at least a portion of the products for sale and stored in a product database as in claim 24. The product information database in Jammes is not accessed for multiple stores and multiple storefronts. Jammes, Figs. 1 and 3. Jammes does disclose multiple

product pages and multiple categories, but not multiple merchants with multiple stores. *Id.* at Fig. 21.

Jammes also fails to disclose that the information concerning the products that is stored in the product database based on dynamic store tags in the e-commerce storefront that reference the product information in the product database as in claims 1 and 24. Jammes discloses the assignment of categories to products, where the categories can be modified by a user with drag and drop operations. *Id.* at ¶209-213. The categories are information that describes the product, but are not store tags. The store tags reference the product information in the product database. For example, in claim 24, the store tags dynamically couple the information stored in the product database to at least one of the e-commerce storefront. The categories established in Jammes can be modified, but are set upon access by a consumer. Jammes, ¶69. In addition, Jammes does disclose HTML hyperlink tags that reference preferred pages. *Id.* at ¶344. The hyperlink tags in Jammes do not reference the product information in the product database and dynamically retrieve that information as claimed. In addition, Jammes fails to disclose a store tag hub configured to manage store tags and that store tags automatically update the e-commerce storefront upon an update to the product database by the user as in claim 24.

For the reasons described above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 24, and 37 are allowable. Likewise, claims dependent from allowable claims 1, 24, and 37 are also allowable. Specifically, dependent claims 2-4, 8, 13-14, 23, 25-27, 33-34, 36 and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Jammes and are allowable for the reasons discussed above regarding the independent claims from which they depend.

II. CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated September 4, 2007 have been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

January 1, 2008

Date

/Scott A. Timmerman/

Scott A. Timmerman

Registration No. 55,678

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

P.O. BOX 10395

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610

(312) 321-4200